

EXHIBIT B

From: Cordova, Laura
Sent: Thursday, August 24, 2023 9:59 AM
To: Armstrong, Scott (CRM); Liolos, John (CRM); Carter III, Thomas (USATXS)
Cc: Murtha, Michael; [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: US v. Hennessey

Scott,

Following up on our call, we will expect an update from your team tomorrow confirming production date of all emails in load files with families connected. As we noted, we cannot wait one or two weeks for this material.

Also, we reiterate our request for the document production number for the [REDACTED] you mentioned in your email as well as the specific documents that Agent [REDACTED] provided in his email (DOJ-PROD-0000363864). If you have any objection to providing this material, please let us know.

Best regards,
Laura

Laura M. Kidd Cordova
[REDACTED]

From: Armstrong, Scott (CRM) [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, August 24, 2023 9:15 AM
To: Cordova, Laura [REDACTED] Liolos, John (CRM) [REDACTED]; Carter III, Thomas (USATXS)
[REDACTED]
Cc: Murtha, Michael [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: US v. Hennessey

****RECEIVED FROM EXTERNAL SENDER – USE CAUTION****

That works

From: Cordova, Laura [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, August 24, 2023 10:13 AM
To: Armstrong, Scott (CRM) [REDACTED] Liolos, John (CRM) [REDACTED]; Carter III, Thomas (USATXS)
[REDACTED]
Cc: Murtha, Michael [REDACTED]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: US v. Hennessey

Are you available at 9:30 CT? We can send a Zoom calendar invite.

Laura M. Kidd Cordova
[REDACTED]

From: Armstrong, Scott (CRM) [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, August 24, 2023 9:11 AM
To: Cordova, Laura [REDACTED] Liolos, John (CRM) [REDACTED] Carter III, Thomas (USATXS)
Cc: Murtha, Michael [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: US v. Hennessey

****RECEIVED FROM EXTERNAL SENDER – USE CAUTION****

We can set up a short call this morning to walk you through any remaining issues. Let us know if there's a time that works.

From: Armstrong, Scott (CRM)
Sent: Wednesday, August 23, 2023 10:47 PM
To: Cordova, Laura [REDACTED] Liolos, John (CRM) [REDACTED] Carter III, Thomas (USATXS)
Cc: Murtha, Michael [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: US v. Hennessey

I will check with the paralegal team. Not sure what the issue is.

From: Cordova, Laura [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, August 23, 2023 9:54 PM
To: Armstrong, Scott (CRM) [REDACTED] Liolos, John (CRM) [REDACTED] Carter III, Thomas (USATXS)
Cc: Murtha, Michael [REDACTED]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: US v. Hennessey

Scott,

We have once again dug into this issue based on the information you have provided, and based on our review, it does not appear that the government's production aligns with what you describe below.

We cannot find the emails with attachments connected in any form (pdf or native) in the production. When we look at the documents you have identified below as the attachments to the emails, there is nothing in the production that we can find that indicates that these documents are indeed the attachments to the emails. Rather, it appears that the documents you say are the attachments are not in fact the attachments. For example:

Requested	Produced Bates, if applicable
DOJ-PROD-0000363734 [REDACTED] is listed in your chart below, but the actual email had two attachments: (1) [REDACTED] and (2) [REDACTED] as noted in my email below.	DOJ-PROD-0000192578-DOJ-PROD-0000192643

In your chart, you identified only one document as an attachment, but the email had two attachments. Nowhere in the metadata or title of the one document you identified is there any indication that this file is either of the two attachments to Agent [REDACTED] email (DOJ-PROD-0000363724), much less, that this one document is both of the attachments.

Further, the document you say is the attachment (DOJ-PROD-0000192578-192643) directly follows DOJ-PROD-0000192577, which is an excel file produced in native format, not an email, and certainly not the same email as DOJ-PROD-0000363734, Agent [REDACTED] May 11, 2022 email. Thus, we are still completely unable to identify the two attachments to Agent [REDACTED] May 11, 2022 email.

The same analysis reveals the same issues with the other documents you have listed as the attachments in your chart below. Based on our extensive review, it appears that none of the documents you list as attachments follow or are attached in native format to any version of the relevant email. None of the purported attachments contain any metadata or other information that link them to the emails.

As noted previously, missing attachments is an issue for many documents in the production, not just the examples we provided.

We reiterate our request that the government produce the documents that were attached to DOJ-PROD-0000363864 [REDACTED] and the referenced analysis. These documents constitute Jencks, Brady, and Giglio materials. You state below that the government has produced [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Please provide the document production number for these "underlying records" and the specific documents that Agent [REDACTED] provided in his email.

Please let us know your earliest availability to discuss how we can resolve these issues.

Best regards,
Laura

Laura M. Kidd Cordova
[REDACTED]

From: Armstrong, Scott (CRM) [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 22, 2023 3:42 PM
To: Cordova, Laura [REDACTED] Liolos, John (CRM) [REDACTED] Carter III, Thomas (USATXS)
[REDACTED]
Cc: Murtha, Michael [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: US v. Hennessey

****RECEIVED FROM EXTERNAL SENDER – USE CAUTION****

To follow up on this one, there was some confusion because there is no "attachment" per se to the email. It looks like the underlying email re the [REDACTED] was just a link. So the Produced Bates for this entry was incorrect. Sorry about that. We have produced to you the underlying records relating to the [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The [REDACTED] is not discoverable.

As to the general methodology, all attachment were pulled directly from their corresponding emails and then either PDF'd for bates stamp or left in original format (*e.g.*, spreadsheets) and bates stamped on file name. If any emails had attachments that were inadvertently not pulled out separately, the email messages were left in .msg format so that users can still go into the email and pull the embedded attachment, which would bear the same bates stamp as the corresponding email. If attachments were already previously produced in prior productions, case team did not reproduce in order to avoid double or triple bates stamping the same document.

From: Armstrong, Scott (CRM)
Sent: Tuesday, August 22, 2023 9:59 AM
To: Cordova, Laura [REDACTED] Liolos, John (CRM) [REDACTED] Carter III, Thomas (USATXS)
Cc: Murtha, Michael [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: US v. Hennessey

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] is in the best position to answer your questions and run them down for you. I'm not sure when she will be back but we will get back to you as soon as we're able.

From: Cordova, Laura [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 21, 2023 2:39 PM
To: Armstrong, Scott (CRM) [REDACTED] Liolos, John (CRM) [REDACTED] Carter III, Thomas (USATXS)
Cc: Murtha, Michael [REDACTED]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: US v. Hennessey

Scott,

Please let us know your availability for a call because time is getting tight given that the trial is two months away and we need to understand some fundamental aspects of the production. Our questions will likely lead to follow-up questions that can be more easily and quickly addressed on a call.

Primarily, we need to understand how the government produced attachments. This is important as it appears that documents were not produced as families. In addition, the documents you identified below as attachments do not appear to be correct. For example:

Requested	Produced Bates, if applicable
DOJ-PROD-0000363864 [REDACTED]	DOJ-PROD-0000340886-DOJ-PROD-0000340886

DOJ-PROD-0000340886 (attached) appears to be a document the government received on May 17, 2023 (see DOJ-PROD-0000340885 attached), which means it could not be the attachment to SA [REDACTED] March 24, 2023 email (DOJ-PROD-0000363864).

Again, none of these documents were produced as load files with families identified, so we need to understand how you believe that DOJ-PROD-0000340886 is the attachment to DOJ-PROD-0000363864.

The list we sent you below are just examples of the attachment issues in the production. There are more, and we need to know how we can connect emails and attachments.

Please let us know your availability for a call.

Best regards,
Laura

Laura M. Kidd Cordova
[REDACTED]

From: Cordova, Laura
Sent: Monday, August 21, 2023 11:16 AM
To: 'Armstrong, Scott (CRM)' [REDACTED] Liolos, John (CRM) [REDACTED] Carter III, Thomas (USATXS) [REDACTED]
Cc: Murtha, Michael [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: US v. Hennessey

Scott,

We've dug into this further based on the information you provided, and we have some fundamental questions about the government's production. Please let us know when you're available for a call to discuss.

Best regards,
Laura

Laura M. Kidd Cordova
[REDACTED]

From: Armstrong, Scott (CRM) [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, August 16, 2023 2:48 PM
To: Cordova, Laura [REDACTED] Liolos, John (CRM) [REDACTED] Carter III, Thomas (USATXS) [REDACTED]
Cc: Murtha, Michael [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: US v. Hennessey

****RECEIVED FROM EXTERNAL SENDER – USE CAUTION****

We looked at the issues that you raised. As you can see below and as we previously mentioned to you, these materials with one exception have already been produced in discovery. We will produce in narrative format the documents referenced in 363793, which are otherwise protected documents that we cannot disclose.

Requested	Produced Bates, if applicable
DOJ-PROD-0000363734 [REDACTED]	DOJ-PROD-0000192578-DOJ-PROD-0000192643
DOJ-PROD-0000363676 [REDACTED]	DOJ-PROD-0000317641-DOJ-PROD-0000317641 DOJ-PROD-0000317642-DOJ-PROD-0000317642 DOJ-PROD-0000317643-DOJ-PROD-0000317643
DOJ-PROD-0000363793 [REDACTED]	DOJ-PROD-0000340995-DOJ-PROD-0000340996
DOJ-PROD-0000363808 [REDACTED]	DOJ-PROD-0000363817-DOJ-PROD-0000363817
DOJ-PROD-0000363636 [REDACTED]	DOJ-PROD-0000193795-DOJ-PROD-0000193795
DOJ-PROD-0000363610	

	DOJ-PROD-0000192793-DOJ-PROD-0000192794
DOJ-PROD-0000363397 [REDACTED]	No attachment
DOJ-PROD-0000363864 [REDACTED]	DOJ-PROD-0000340886-DOJ-PROD-0000340886

From: Cordova, Laura [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, August 9, 2023 12:02 PM

To: Armstrong, Scott (CRM) [REDACTED]

Liolos, John (CRM) [REDACTED]

Carter III,

Thomas (USATXS) [REDACTED]

Cc: Murtha, Michael [REDACTED]

Subject: [EXTERNAL] US v. Hennessey

Counsel,

As previously requested, please produce the attachments that are missing from the government's production. Although we notified you last month that many attachments were missing from the July 10 production (Production 16) and requested them, it appears we still have not received many missing documents. Below are some examples, but this is not an exhaustive list.

1. DOJ-PROD-0000363734 – We are not able to locate the attachments [REDACTED]
2. DOJ-PROD-0000363676 – We are not able to locate the attachments [REDACTED]
3. DOJ-PROD-0000363793 – We are not able to locate the attachments [REDACTED]
4. DOJ-PROD-0000363566 – We are not able to locate the attachment [REDACTED]
5. DOJ-PROD-0000363808 – We are not able to locate the attachment [REDACTED]
6. DOJ-PROD-0000363636 – We are not able to locate the attachment [REDACTED]
7. DOJ-PROD-0000363610 – We are not able to locate the attachment [REDACTED]
[REDACTED].
8. DOJ-PROD-0000363397 – We are not able to locate the attachment [REDACTED]
9. DOJ-PROD-0000363864 – We are not able to locate the attachment [REDACTED]

In addition, please provide the analysis referenced in the March 24, 2023 email from [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] (DOJ-PROD-0000363864) and all related communications and documents, which, among other things, are *Brady* and *Giglio* material.

We request that the government fulfill its obligation to ensure that all *Brady*, *Giglio*, and Jencks material are produced to the defendants. While it is not the defendants' obligation to perform quality control or identify missing documents in the government's production, we are available to discuss these issues if that would be helpful.

Best regards,
Laura

Laura M. Kidd Cordova
[REDACTED]

